

### **III. REMARKS**

Applicant has considered the current Office Action with mailing date of May 1, 2007. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 22, 30 and 31 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US 20020120918, hereinafter “Aizenbud”, in view of US Patent No. 6732153, hereinafter “Jakobson.” Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 – 32 over Aizenbud in view of Jakobson, Applicant respectfully reiterates that the cited references, Aizenbud and Jakobson, independently or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

In addition to all previous arguments filed on September 5, 2006, January 16, 2007 and August 2, 2007, Applicant submits that Aizenbud and/or Jakobson do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “...wherein the review standard includes review parameters selected from a group consisting of:

character limits, line limits, spell checks, grammar checks and a combination thereof ...”, claim 1. Support for this amendment is found in ¶[0026], ¶[0032] and ¶[0034] in the originally filed specification of the application.

Applicant submits that unlike the claimed invention, Aizenbud at ¶[0078] provides a message flow debugger to “enable the message flow developer to track a message from the initial queue ...”. Specifically, Aizenbud’s message debugger is to track and/or edit the manner in which a message flows according to “the processing logic of a ... message flow diagram”, ¶[0054]. As such Aizenbud’s tracking and/or editing of message flow has no relevance to reviewing a natural language message for its compliance with a review standard set by review parameters of “...character limits, line limits, spell checks [and] grammar checks...”. Claim 1. A person of ordinary skill looking for a review standard to ascertain the structure of a natural language message will not look to Aizenbud’s message debugger because the message debugger determines **how a message flow** within a system. If a person of ordinary skill follows Aizenbud, he will not establish a review standard with the review parameters for analyzing a natural language for its merits. Instead, such a person will be lead away from the claimed invention because there is no nexus between tracking or editing a message flow and reviewing the linguistic aspect or structure of a message. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection.

The Office allegedly asserts that the input message in Aizenbud teaches or suggests the claimed message crafted in natural language and that Aizenbud’s message processing nodes teach or suggest the claimed feature of configuring a review standard for natural language messages. Assuming *arguendo* that the Office’s assertions are as alleged, then Aizenbud must teach or suggest a review standard with review parameters including “...character limits, line limits, spell checks, grammar checks...”, claim 1, for ascertaining the structure of a message. However, nowhere in

Aizenbud is the claimed feature of a review standard based on the review parameters taught or suggested. On the contrary, Aizenbud's message processing nodes to "determine the flow of the messages", ¶[0055] "... cover a range of activities, including reformatting,... transformation,...routing, ... archiving, ...merging ...", ¶[0054]. None of these activities include the claimed feature of configuring a review standard for ascertaining the structure of a message. Even where the transformation of a message includes the actions of: adding, deleting or updating fields, a message processing node still does not include configuring a review standard and reviewing a message to ascertain the structure of the message according to the review parameters. The actions of adding, deleting or updating are, at best, editorial acts and not acts that establish a standard of review or acts that executes a review. Aizenbud does not teach or suggest that the actions for transforming a message constitute configuring a review standard and reviewing a message according to such a standard. It appears that the Office has taken Official Notice in asserting that Aizenbud's message processing nodes teaches or suggest configuring a review standard with the claimed review parameters. However, the Official Notice is unsupported by any factual evidence. Applicant respectfully requests that the Office provide the necessary support for the Official Notice or withdraw this rejection.

On page 3 of the current Office Action, the Office notes that Aizenbud is deficient in teaching or suggesting the claimed feature of "...reviewing the message based on the review standard to detect errors...", claim 1. However, the Office asserts that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to cure Aizenbud's deficiency with Jakobson. According to Aizenbud at ¶[0059], "[the] message processing node will process an input message as soon as it arrives...". That is, Aizenbud's message flow does not require a review of the structure of each message. It is the flow of a message that is being ascertained in Aizenbud and not the structure of a message. Having

Jakobson's parsing step incorporated in Aizenbud's message flow mechanism does not lead to "reviewing ... based on the [claimed] review standard". Claim 1. Both cited references do not teach or suggest establishing a review standard according to review parameters. Even when, assuming *arguendo*, a person of ordinary skill combines Aizenbud and Jakobson, he would, at best, have each message parsed but not reviewed/analyzed against review parameters. That is, parsing a message does not equate to reviewing a message on the basis of "review parameters [including] character limits, line limits, spell checks and grammar checks", claim 1. It appears that the Office rejection is based on hindsight, which Applicant respectfully reminds, is not permissible. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection. Consequently, Applicant respectfully request that the Office also withdraw the rejection of all dependent claims (claims 2 – 10) appended to claim 1.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of subject matter in system claims 11 – 20 and computer product claims 22 – 32, Applicant incorporates the foregoing and previously presented arguments set out with respect to subject matter claimed in claims 1 - 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejections of all claims.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique feature. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the use of references independently or in combination and/or modifications in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed

herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2007

/Hunter E. Webb/  
Hunter E. Webb  
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

HEW/TC